Domination in commuting graph and its complement

E. Vatandoost and Y. Golkhandypour

Department of mathematics, International university of imam Khomeini, Qazvin, Iran
vatandoost@sci.ikiu.ac.ir and y.golkhandypour@edu.ikiu.ac.ir

arXiv:1609.07274v1 [math.RA] 23 Sep 2016

Abstract

For each non-commutative ring R, the commuting graph of R is a graph with vertex set $R \setminus Z(R)$ and two vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $x \neq y$ and $xy = yx$. In this paper, we consider the domination and signed domination numbers on commuting graph $\Gamma(R)$ for non-commutative ring R with $Z(R) = \{0\}$. For a finite ring R, it is shown that $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = |R|$ if and only if R is non-commutative ring on 4 elements. Also we determine the domination number of $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$ and commuting graph of non-commutative ring R of order p^3, where p is prime. Moreover we present an upper bound for signed domination number of $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$.

keywords: *Noncommutative ring; Commuting graph; Domination number; signed domination number.*

1. Introduction

Let R be a non-commutative ring, $Z(R)$ denoted the center of R and for $a \in R$, $C(a)$ denotes the centeralizer of a in R. The commuting graph of R, denoted by $\Gamma(R)$, is a graph with vertex set $R \setminus Z(R)$ and joined two vertices x and y if and only if $x \neq y$ and $xy = yx$. This graph was introduced by Akbari et al. [2], and the complement of commuting graph of R is denoted by $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. See [1], [2], [3], [4] and [14] for more details.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph comprising a set $V(G)$ of vertices together with a set $E(G)$ of edges. A graph G is said to be *connected* if each pair of vertices are joined by a walk. The number of edges of the shortest walk joining v and u is called the *distance* between v and u and denoted by $d(v, u)$. The maximum value of the distance function in a connected graph G is called the *diameter* of G and denoted by $diam(G)$. The neigbours of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is the set of edges incident to the v and denoted by $N(v)$ and $|N(v)| = deg(v)$. The maximum degree of a graph G denoted by $\Delta(G)$, and the minimum degree of a graph G denoted by $\delta(G)$, are the maximum and minimum degree of its vertices. The *complete graph*, K_n, is a graph with n vertices in which each pair of vertices are adjacent. A *complete bipartite graph* is a graph whose vertices can be divided into two disjoint set A and B such that each edge is incident to a vertex in A and a vertex in B and denoted by $K_{n,m}$ where $|A| = n$ and $|B| = m$.

The *strong product*, $G \boxtimes H$, of graphs G and H is a graph whose structure is as follows:

i) The vertex set of $G \boxtimes H$ is the Cartesian product $V(G) \times V(H)$.

ii) Any two distinct vertices (v, v') and (u, u') are adjacent in $G \boxtimes H$ if and only if v is adjacent to u in G and $v' = u'$, or $v = u$ and v' is adjacent to u' in H, or v is adjacent to u in G and v' is adjacent to u' in H.

The *corona* $G = G_1 \circ G_2$ is the graph formed from one copy of G_1 and $|V(G_1)|$ copies of G_2 where the ith vertex of G_1 is adjacent to every vertex in the ith copy of G_2.

A *dominating set* of G is a subset D of V(G) such that every vertex not in D is adjacent to at least one vertex in D. The domination number of G is the number of vertices in a minimal dominating set for G and denoted by $\gamma(G)$. See [8], [9] and [15] for more details.

The closed neighbour of v, denoted by $N[v]$, is the set $N(v) \cup \{v\}$. A function $f : V \to \{-1, 1\}$ is a signed dominating function if for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, the closed neighbour of v

contains more vertices with function value 1 than with -1. Thus f is a signed dominating function if $f[v] \geq 1$ for all $v \in V(G)$, where $f[v] = \sum_{v \in V(G)} f(v)$. The weight of f, denoted $f(G)$, is the sum of the function value of all vertices in G, i.e., $f(G) = \sum_{x \in V(G)} f(x)$. The *signed domination number* of G, denoted $\gamma_s(G)$, is the minimum weight of signed dominating functions of G. Also the set of vertices with function value -1 is denoted by $V^-(G)$.
In this paper, we consider the domination and signed domination numbers on commuting graph $\Gamma(R)$ for non-commutative ring R with $Z(R) = \{0\}$. For a finite ring R, it is shown that $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = |R|$ if and only if R is the non-commutative ring on 4 elements. Also we determine the domination number of $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$ and commuting graph of non-commutative ring R of order p^3, where p is prime. Moreover we present an upper bound for the signed domination number of $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. The main results in this paper are the following.

Theorem A. Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then
i) $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n$ if and only if R is isomorphic with one of the following rings:
$E = \langle x, y \,:\, 2x = 2y = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = x,\, yx = y \rangle$
$F = \langle x, y \,:\, 2x = 2y = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = y,\, yx = x \rangle$.
ii) $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \neq n - 1$.
iii) $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 2$ if and only if n is even and $\Gamma(R) = K_3 \cup (n-4)K_1$.

Theorem B. Let R be a non-commutative ring of order p^3 and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then
i) $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = p^2 + p + 1$.
or
ii) $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \ell_1 + \ell_2$, where ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 satisfy in $\ell_1 + (p+1)\ell_2 = p^2 + p + 1$.

Theorem C. Let R_i, $(1 \leq i \leq t)$, be non-commutative ring of order n_i and $Z(R_i) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) = Min_{1 \leq i \leq t}(\gamma(\Gamma(R_i)))$.

Theorem D. Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$.
i) Let n be even. Then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = n - 1$ if and only if R is isomorphic with one of the following rings:
$E = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = x, yx = y \rangle$
$F = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = y, yx = x \rangle$.
ii) Let n be odd. Then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = n - 1$ if and only if $\Gamma(R)$ is the union of $\frac{n-1}{2}$ copies of P_2.

Theorem E. Let R_i, $1 \leq i \leq t$ be non-commutative ring such that $|R_i| = n_i$ and $Z(R_i) = \{0\}$. Also, let δ_i be minimum degree of $\Gamma(R_i)$.
i) If for all $1 \leq i \leq t$, δ_i is odd, then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i - \prod_{i=1}^{t}(\delta_i + 2) + 2$.
ii) Otherwise, $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i - \prod_{i=1}^{t}(\delta_i + 2) + 1$.

2. Preliminaries

First we give some facts that are needed in the section III.

2.1. On commuting graph

Lemma 2.1.1 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. If $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ contains a vertex of degree k, then $k > \frac{n-1}{2}$.*

Proof. On the contrary, let v be a vertex of degree k in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ such that $k \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. So $|C(v)| \geq \frac{n-1}{2} + 1$. Thus $|C(v)| \nmid n$, which is impossible. Hence $deg(v) > \frac{n-1}{2}$, for each $v \in \overline{\Gamma}(R)$. □

Lemma 2.1.2 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\Gamma(R)$ is not a cycle. Also, $\Gamma(R)$ does not have C_4 as a component.*

Proof. On the contrary, let $\Gamma(R) = C_{n-1}$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1} \in V(C_{n-1})$, such that $v_i \in N(v_{i+1})$. So $C(v_i) = \{0, v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}\}$. Since $C(v_i)$ is a subgroup of $(R, +)$, $v_{i-1} + v_{i+1} \in C(v_i)$. If $v_{i-1} + v_{i+1} = 0$, then $v_{i-1} = -v_{i+1}$. It follows that $v_{i-2} \in N(v_{i+1})$, which is impossible. If $v_{i-1} + v_{i+1} \in \{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}\}$, then $v_{i-1} = 0$ or $v_{i+1} = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $v_{i-1} +$

$v_{i+1} = v_i$. Also, $C(v_{i-1}) = \{0, v_{i-1}, v_{i-2}, v_i\}$. Similarly, $v_{i-2} + v_{i-1} = v_i$. Hence $v_{i-2} = v_{i+1}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $\Gamma(R)$ is not a cycle.
Also let $\Gamma(R)$ has C_4 as a component and let $V(C_4) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ such that $x_1 \notin N(x_2)$. Then $|C(x_1) \cap C(x_2)| = 3$, which is impossible. □

Lemma 2.1.3 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\Gamma(R)$ does not have both an isolated vertex and a vertex of degree one.*

Proof. On the contrary, let x be an isolated vertex and y be a vertex of degree 1 in $\Gamma(R)$. So $C(x) = \{0, x\}$ and $C(y) = \{0, y, -y\}$. If $C(x) + C(y) = H$, then H is a subgroup of $(R, +)$ and $|H| = 6$. Since $x + y \in H$ and $O(x + y) = 6$, $(H, +)$ is a cyclic group. Thus $C(x + y) = H$. It follows that K_5 is a subgraph of commuting graph. So x is not an isolated vertex, which is contradiction. □

Theorem 2.1.4 *[14] Let R be a non-commutative finite ring with $|R| > 4$. Then $diam(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$.*

Theorem 2.1.5 *[14] Let R be a non-commutative ring. Then $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is not a complete bipartite graph.*

Lemma 2.1.6 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $n \neq 6$.*

Proof. On the contrary, let $n = 6$. By Lemma 2.1.1, $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \geq 3$. If $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 4$, then $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = K_5$, contrary to Theorem 2.1.4. So $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 3$. Since there is no $3-$regular graph on 5 vertices, $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 4$. Hence $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is one of the graphs that are shown in figure 1.



*fig*1.

In both graphs, $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of isolated vertices and copies of P_2, contrary to Lemma 2.1.3. Therefore $n \neq 6$. □

Corollary 2.1.7 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $n = 4$ or $n \geq 8$.*

Lemma 2.1.8 *Let R be a ring of order p, where p is prime. Then R is a commutative ring.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Theorem 2.1.9 *[14] Let R be a non-commutative ring of order p^2, where p is a prime number. Then R is one of the following rings.*
$E = \langle x, y : px = py = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = x,\, yx = y \rangle$
$F = \langle x, y : px = py = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = y,\, yx = x \rangle$.

Theorem 2.1.10 *[14] Let R be a non-commutative finite ring with $diam(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$. Then R is of type E or F (see Theorem 2.1.9).*

Theorem 2.1.11 *[2] For any non-commutative ring R and $x, y \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$, there is a path between x and y in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ whose length is at most two.*

Lemma 2.1.12 *Let R be a finite ring of order p^2 and $Z(R) \neq \{0\}$. Then R is commutative.*

Proof. On the contrary, let R be a non-commutative ring. It follows immediately that $|Z(R)| = p$. Clearly, for any $x \in R \setminus Z(R)$, $|C(x)| > p$ and $|C(x)| \mid p^2$. So $|C(x)| = p^2$ and $x \in Z(R)$, a contradiction. Therefore R is commutative ring. □

Lemma 2.1.13 *Let R be a non-commutative ring and $x, y \in V(\Gamma(R))$ such that $C(x)$ and $C(y)$ are commutative. If $y \in C(x)$, then $C(x) = C(y)$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Theorem 2.1.14 *[17]* **(Scorza)** *Let $\{A_i : 1 \leq i \leq 3\}$ be an irredundant cover with core-free intersection D for a group G. Then $D = 1$ and $G \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2$.*

2.2. On domination number

Lemma 2.2.1 *[12] Let G be a graph on n vertices. Then $\gamma(G) = 1$ if and only if $\Delta(G) = n - 1$.*

Theorem 2.2.2 *[13] Let G be a graph on n vertices. Then*

i) $\gamma(G) + \gamma(\overline{G}) \leq n + 1$.

ii) $\gamma(G)\gamma(\overline{G}) \leq n$.

Theorem 2.2.3 *[7] Let G be a graph without isolated vertices on n vertices such that n is even. Then $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if the components of G are C_4 or $H \circ K_1$ where H is a connected graph.*

Theorem 2.2.4 *[15] Let G be a graph with no isolated vertex. Then $\gamma(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$.*

Theorem 2.2.5 *[5], [18] For any graph G,*

$$\lceil \tfrac{n}{1+\Delta(G)} \rceil \leq \gamma(G) \leq n - \Delta(G).$$

Theorem 2.2.6 *[16] If a graph G has no isolated vertices, then*

$$\gamma(G) \leq \tfrac{n+2-\delta(G)}{2}.$$

2.3. On signed domination number

Lemma 2.3.1 *[10] A graph G has $\gamma_s(G) = n$ if and only if every $v \in G$ is either isolated, an endvertex or adjacent to an endvertex.*

Lemma 2.3.2 *Let G be a graph on n vertices and α be an odd number. Then $\gamma_s(G) \neq n - \alpha$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Theorem 2.3.3 *[11] Let K_n be a complete graph on n vertices. Then*

$$\gamma_s(K_n) = \begin{cases} 2 & n \text{ be even} \\ 1 & n \text{ be odd.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.3.4 *Let G be a graph with $\delta(G) \geq 6$. Then $|V^-(G)| \geq 3$.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(G)$ and $deg(v) = \delta(G) \geq 6$. If $N(v) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{\delta(G)}\}$, then consider the function $f : V(G) \to \{-1, 1\}$ for which $f(v) = f(v_1) = f(v_2) = -1$. Clearly, $f[w] \geq 1$ where $w \in \{v, v_1, v_2\}$. So $|V^-(G)| \geq 3$. □

Lemma 2.3.5 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order 8 and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $deg(v) = k$. By Lemma 2.1.1, $k \geq 4$. If $k = 5$, then $|C(v)| \nmid |R|$, which is a contradiction. Hence $k \in \{4, 6\}$. If $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 6$, then $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = K_7$, contrary to Theorem 2.1.4.
Let $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 4$. Then $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \in \{4, 6\}$. If $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 4$, then $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a 4-regular graph on 7 vertices, which are depicted in figure 2.



fig2.

In both graphs, $\Gamma(R) = C_7$, contrary to Lemma 2.1.2.
Let $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 6$. Then $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has at least two vertices v and u of degree 4. We consider the following two cases.
Case 1. Let $v \in N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. Then $C(v) = \{0, v, x_1, x_2\}$ and $C(u) = \{0, u, y_1, y_2\}$. So $|C(v) \cap C(u)| \in \{1, 2\}$.
If $|C(v) \cap C(u)| = 1$, then $|C(v) + C(u)| > |R|$, which is impossible.
Let $|C(v) \cap C(u)| = 2$, $C(v) = \{0, v, x_1, x_2\}$ and $C(u) = \{0, u, x_1, y_2\}$. Thus $x_1 \notin N(v) \cup N(u)$, $y_2 \in N(v)$ and $x_2 \in N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ and there exist $z_1, z_2 \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $z_1, z_2 \in N(v) \cap N(u)$. This case will be divided into 2 subcases.
Subcase i. If $deg(x_1) = 6$, then $x_1 \in N(v) \cap N(u)$, a contradiction.
Subcase ii. Let $deg(x_1) = 4$. Since $x_1 \notin N(v) \cup N(u)$, it follows that $\{y_2, x_2, z_1, z_2\} \subseteq N(x_1)$. Similarly, since $y_2 \in N(v)$ and $x_2 \in N(u)$, it follows that $\{z_1, z_2\} \subseteq N(y_2) \cap N(x_2)$. Thus $deg(x_2) = deg(y_2) = 4$. We claim that $z_1 \notin N(z_2)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. For let $z_1 \in N(z_2)$. Then by the above argument, z_1 and z_2 have exactly two common neigbours. But $v, u, y_2, x_2 \in N(z_1) \cap N(z_2)$, which is a contradiction. Hence

$z_1 \notin N(z_2)$, as claimed. Thus $deg(z_1) = deg(z_2) = 5$, which is impossible. Therefore this case will not happen.

Case 2. Let $v \notin N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. Then $C(v) = C(u) = \{0, v, u, \alpha\}$. So there exist $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \in N(v) \cap N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$.

If $deg(\alpha) = 6$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$, then $\alpha \in N(v)$, a contradiction. So $deg(\alpha) = 4$ and $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \in N(\alpha)$. We claim that $deg(z_i) = 6$, where $1 \leq i \leq 4$. On the contrary, let there exist $1 \leq i \leq 4$ such that $deg(z_i) = 4$. Since $z_i \in N(v)$, as in the Case 1, z_i and v should have two common neigbours. Hence $deg(z_i) = 5$, which is a contradiction. Thus $deg(z_i) = 6$.

Consider the function $f : V(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \to \{-1, 1\}$ for which $f(v) = f(u) = f(\alpha) = -1$ and $f(z_i) = 1$, where $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Clearly, $f[w] \geq 1$, for all $w \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$. This implies that $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| \geq 3$.

If g is a signed domination function on $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ and $|\{w; g(w) = -1\}| > 3$, then $g[\ell] = -1$ for some $\ell \in \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| = 3$, and this completed the proof. □

Lemma 2.3.6 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order $2p$, where p is an odd prime and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$.*

proof. Let $|R| = 2p$. Then by Lemma 2.1.6, $p > 3$. Let $v \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $deg(v) = k$. By Lemma 2.1.1, $k \geq p$. Clearly, if $k \notin \{p, 2p-2\}$, then $|C(v)| \nmid 2p$, which is impossible. Thus $k \in \{p, 2p-2\}$. If $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2p-2$, then $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a complete graph, contrary to Theorem 2.1.4. If $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = p$, then we have a p-regular graph on $2p-1$ vertices, which is impossible. So $\Delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2p-2$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has at least two vertices v and u of degree p. The following two cases will be considered.

Case 1. Let $v \in N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. Then $C(v) = \{0, v, x_1, \ldots, x_{p-2}\}$ and $C(u) = \{0, u, y_1, \ldots, y_{p-2}\}$. Thus $|C(v) \cap C(u)| = 1$ and so $|C(v) + C(u)| = p^2 > 2p$, which is impossible.

Therefore this case will not happen.

Case 2. Let $v \notin N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. Then $C(v) = \{0, v, u, x_1, \ldots, x_{p-3}\}$ and $C(u) = \{0, u, v, y_1, \ldots, y_{p-3}\}$. Thus $|C(v) \cap C(u)| = p$ and so $C(v) = C(u) = \{0, v, u, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{p-3}\}$. Hence there exist $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p \in N(v) \cap N(u)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. Obviously, $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{p-3} \notin N(v) \cup N(u)$. We claim that induced subgraph on $\{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{p-3}\}$ is empty. On the contrary, let $z_1 \in N(z_2)$. By Case 1, $deg(z_1) \neq p$, $deg(z_2) \neq p$ or $deg(z_1), deg(z_2) \neq p$. Whithout loss of generality, let $deg(z_1) = 2p-2$. Since $|\{z_2, z_3, \ldots, z_{p-3}\}| + |\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p\}| = 2p-4$, it follows that $deg(z_1) \leq 2p-4$, which is a contradiction. Thus $z_1 \notin N(z_2)$. Similarly, $z_i \notin N(z_j)$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq p-3$, and so induced subgraph on $\{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{p-3}\}$ is empty, as claimed. Hence $deg(z_i) = p$, where $1 \leq i \leq p-3$ and by Case 1, for each $\ell \in \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p\}$, $deg(\ell) = 2p-2$.

Consider the function $f : V(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \to \{-1, 1\}$ for which $f(v) = f(u) = f(z_i) = -1$, where $1 \leq i \leq p-3$ and $f(\alpha_j) = 1$, where $1 \leq j \leq p$. Clearly, $f[w] \geq 1$, for all $w \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$. This implies that $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| \geq p-1$.

If g is a signed domination function on $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ and $|\{w; g(w) = -1\}| > p-1$, then $g[\ell] = -1$ for some $\ell \in \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p\}$, which is contradiction. Therefore $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| = p-1$ and this completed the proof. □

3. Main Results

In this section we prove our main results.

3.1. Domination number in $\Gamma(R)$

Theorem 3.1.1 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order odd number n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$ if and only if $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of $\frac{n-1}{2}$ copies of P_2. Also $n = 3^k$ for $k > 1$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$. Since n is odd, $\Gamma(R)$ does not have isolated vertex. By Theorem 2.2.3, the components of $\Gamma(R)$ are C_4 or $H \circ K_1$ where H is a connected graph. By Lemma 2.1.2, $\Gamma(R)$ does not have C_4 as a component. Hence the components of $\Gamma(R)$ are $H \circ K_1$. Let x be an endvertex in $\Gamma(R)$ and $x \in N(y)$. Then $C(x) = \{0, x, y\}$. If $O(x) = 2$, then n is even,

which is false. So $O(x) \neq 2$. If $-x \neq y$, then x is adjacent to $-x$ in $\Gamma(R)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $-x = y$ and so $deg(y) = 1$. Thus $\Gamma(R)$ is union of $\frac{n-1}{2}$ copies of P_2. Therefore for every $0 \neq z \in R$, $C(z) = \{0, z, -z\}$ and so $O(z) = 3$. Hence $n = 3^k$ for $k > 1$. The proof of converse is easy. □

Corollary 3.1.2 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n such that n and $|Z(R)| = t$ are odd. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \frac{n-t}{2}$ if and only if $\Gamma(R)$ is the union of $\frac{n-t}{2}$ copies of P_2.*

Lemma 3.1.3 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \geq 3$.*

Proof. On the contrary, let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) < 3$. If $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 1$, then there exist $x \in R \setminus Z(R)$ such that $C(x) = R$, which is impossible. Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 2$ and $D = \{x, y\}$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(R)$. Then $R = C(x) \cup C(y)$. Hence $C(x) \subseteq C(y)$ or $C(y) \subseteq C(x)$. Without loss of generality, let $C(x) \subseteq C(y)$. Then $R = C(y)$ and so $y \in Z(R)$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 3.1.4 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 3$ if and only if R is isomorphic with one of the following rings:*
$E = \langle x, y : 2x = 2y = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = x,\, yx = y\rangle$
$F = \langle x, y : 2x = 2y = 0\,,\, x^2 = x\,,\, y^2 = y\,,\, xy = y,\, yx = x\rangle$.

Proof. It is not hard to see that $\gamma(\Gamma(E)) = \gamma(\Gamma(F)) = 3$. Conversely, let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 3$ and $D = \{x, y, z\}$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(R)$. Then $R = C(x) \cup C(y) \cup C(z)$. By Theorem 2.1.14, $(R, +) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2$. On the other hand, exactly E and F are non-commutative rings between all rings of order four. □

Corollary 3.1.5 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) \neq \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \geq 4$.*

Lemma 3.1.6 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n with $Z(R) = \{0\}$. If $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$, then $n = 2^t$ for positive integer t.*

Proof. Let $D = \{x\}$ be a dominating set in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. So x is an isolated vertex in $\Gamma(R)$, and so $O(x) = 2$. Hence $n = 2k$. On the contrary, let $p \mid n$, where p is an odd prime. So there exist $y \in R$ such that $O(y) = p$. Hence $py = 0, px = x$ and $2y \neq 0$. So $2ypx = 0$. Thus $2y \in C(x)$ and so $2y = x$. It follows that $O(y) = 4$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $n = 2^t$. □

Lemma 3.1.7 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order odd number n, $Z(R) = \{0\}$ and $3 \nmid n$. Then $3 < \gamma(\Gamma(R)) < \frac{n-1}{2}$.*

Proof. Since n is odd, $\Gamma(R)$ does not have isolated vertex. So by Theorem 2.2.4, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. If $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$, then by Theorem 3.1.1, $n = 3^k$ for $k > 1$, which is a contradiction. By Lemma 3.1.3, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \geq 3$. if $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 3$, then by Lemma 3.1.4, $n = 4$, which is impossible. Therefore $3 < \gamma(\Gamma(R)) < \frac{n-1}{2}$. □

Lemma 3.1.8 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) < \frac{n-1}{2}$.*

Proof. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a connected graph, $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. If $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$, then by Theorem 2.2.3, $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = C_4$ or $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = H \circ K_1$ where H is a connected graph. In both cases $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = 2$, contrary to Lemma 3.1.3. Therefore $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) < \frac{n-1}{2}$. □

Theorem 3.1.9 *Let R be a non-commutative ring and $Z(R) \neq \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \geq 2$.*

Proof. On the contrary, let $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$ and $D = \{x\}$ be a dominating set in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$. So $C(x) = Z(R) \cup \{x\}$. Let $0 \neq y \in Z(R)$. So $x(y + x) = (y + x)x$, and so $y + x \in C(x)$. If $y + x = x$, then $y = 0$, which is impossible. Also if $y + x \in Z(R)$, then $x \in Z(R)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \geq 2$. □

Corollary 3.1.10 *If R is a non-commutative ring with unity, then $\Gamma(R)$ has no isolated vertices.*

Proof of Theorem A.
i) Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n$. If $\Gamma(R)$ has no isolated vertex, then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$, by Theorem 2.2.4. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a connected graph, $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Thus $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) +$

$\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq n-1$, which contradicts the assumption. Hence $\Gamma(R)$ has at least one isolated vertex. Thus $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$ and so $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = n-1$. Therefore $\Gamma(R) = (n-1)K_1$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = K_{n-1}$. By Theorem 2.1.10, R is of type E or F. The proof of converse is clear.
ii) Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n-1$. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a connected graph, $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. If $\Gamma(R)$ has no isolated vertex, then by Theorem 2.2.4, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. So $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$, contrary to Lemma 3.1.8. Hence $\Gamma(R)$ has at least one isolated vertex and so $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$. Thus $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = n-2$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma(R) = (n-3)K_1 \cup P_2$, contrary to Lemma 2.1.3. Therefore $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \neq n-1$.
iii) Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) + \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n-2$. If $\Gamma(R)$ has no isolated vertex, then by Theorem 2.2.4, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is connected graph, $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. By Lemma 3.1.8, $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) < \frac{n-1}{2}$. If $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2} - 1$, then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \frac{n-1}{2}$. By Theorem 3.1.1, $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of $\frac{n-1}{2}$ copies of P_2. It follows that $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a regular multipartite graph of size two. Hence $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$, which contradicts the fact that n is not prime. Also if $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq \frac{n-5}{2}$, then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) > \frac{n-1}{2}$, contrary to Theorem 2.2.4.
Thus $\Gamma(R)$ has at least one isolated vertex and so $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = n-3$. Let $D = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-3}\}$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(R)$. Then there exist unique vertices $x_i, x_j \in D$ such that $x_{n-1} \in N(x_i)$ and $x_{n-2} \in N(x_j)$ in $\Gamma(R)$. It is clear that induced subgraph on $D \setminus \{x_i, x_j\}$ is empty. Let $A = \{x_i, x_j, x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}\}$. The proof will be divided into 2 cases.
Case 1. If $x_i \neq x_j$, then by Lemma 2.1.3, induced subgraph on A is C_4, contrary to Lemma 2.1.2.
Case 2. If $x_i = x_j$, then by Lemma 2.1.3, induced subgraph on A is K_3 and so $\Gamma(R) = K_3 \cup (n-4)K_1$. Also we has $C(x_{n-1}) = \{0, x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_i = x_j\}$. So $4 \mid n$. Hence $|R| = n$ is even. The proof of converse is clear. □

Theorem 3.1.11 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order p^2 and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. Then $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = p+1$.*

Proof. We refer the reader to [[14], Th. 4]. □

Lemma 3.1.12 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order p^3 and $Z(R) = \{0\}$. If $x, y \in V(\Gamma(R))$ and $xy \neq yx$, then $C(x) \cap C(y) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Let $z \in V(\Gamma(R))$. Since $C(z)$ is the addition subgroup of R, $|C(z)| \in \{p, p^2\}$. The following 3 cases will be considered.
Case1. Let $|C(x)| = |C(y)| = p$. Then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| \in \{1, p\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = 1$, then $C(x) \cap C(y) = \{0\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = p$, then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = |C(x)|$. Since $C(x) \cap C(y) \subseteq C(x)$, $C(x) \cap C(y) = C(x)$. Thus $C(x) \subseteq C(y)$. This contradicts the fact that $y \notin C(x)$.
Case 2. Let $|C(x)| = |C(y)| = p^2$. Then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| \in \{1, p, p^2\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = 1$, then $C(x) \cap C(y) = \{0\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = p$, then there exist $z \in V(\Gamma(R))$ such that $z \in C(x) \cap C(y)$. By Lemmas 2.1.12 and 2.1.13, $C(x) = C(z)$ and $C(y) = C(z)$. Thus $C(x) = C(y)$, a contradiction.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = p^2$, then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = |C(x)|$. Since $C(x) \cap C(y) \subseteq C(x)$, $C(x) \cap C(y) = C(x)$. Thus $C(x) \subseteq C(y)$. This contradicts the fact that $y \notin C(x)$.
Case 3. Let $|C(x)| = p$ and $|C(y)| = p^2$. Then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| \in \{1, p\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = 1$, then $C(x) \cap C(y) = \{0\}$.
If $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = p$, then $|C(x) \cap C(y)| = |C(x)|$. Since $C(x) \cap C(y) \subseteq C(x)$, $C(x) \cap C(y) = C(x)$. Thus $C(x) \subseteq C(y)$. By Lemma 2.1.12, $C(y)$ is commutative. So for every $z \in C(y)$, $zx = xz$. Thus $z \in C(x)$ and so $C(y) \subseteq C(x)$. Hence $C(y) = C(x)$, which contradicts the fact that $y \notin C(x)$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem B. Let $x, y \in V(\Gamma(R))$ and $y \notin C(x)$. Then $|C(x)|, |C(y)| \in \{p, p^2\}$. Also by Lemma 3.1.12, $C(x) \cap C(y) = \{0\}$. Let $|C(x)| = |C(y)| = p$. If $z \in C(x)$, $t \in C(y)$ and $zt = tz$, then by Lemma 2.1.13, $C(x) = C(z)$, $C(y) = C(t)$ and $C(z) = C(t)$. So $C(x) = C(y)$, which is impossible. Therefore $\Gamma(R)$ is the disjoint union of ℓ copies of the complete graph of size $p-1$. So $|V(\Gamma(R))| = \ell(p-1)$. On

the other hand we have $|V(\Gamma(R))| = p^3 - 1$. Thus $\ell = p^2 + p + 1$. Since $\gamma(K_{p-1}) = 1$, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = p^2 + p + 1$, and (i) is proved.
Suppose $|C(x)| = p$ and $|C(y)| = p^2$. If $z \in C(x)$, $t \in C(y)$, then $zt \neq tz$. Therefore $\Gamma(R)$ is the disjoint union of ℓ_1 copies of the complete graph of size $p-1$ and ℓ_2 copies of the complete graph of size $p^2 - 1$. So $|V(\Gamma(R))| = \ell_1(p-1) + \ell_2(p^2-1)$. On the other hand we have $|V(\Gamma(R))| = p^3 - 1$. Thus $\ell_1(p-1) + \ell_2(p^2-1) = p^3 - 1$ and so $\ell_1 + (p+1)\ell_2 = p^2 + p + 1$. Obviously, $\gamma(\Gamma(R)) = \ell_1 + \ell_2$, and (ii) is proved. Finally, if $|C(x)| = |C(y)| = p^2$, then $|C(x) + C(y)| = p^4$, which is impossible. □

Proof of Theorem C. Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R_i)) = m_i$ and $D_i = \{v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \ldots, v_{im_i}\}$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_i)$, where $1 \leq i \leq t$. Without loss of generality, let $m_1 \leq m_i$, for every $1 \leq i \leq t$. We claim that, $D = \{(v_{1j}, 0, \ldots, 0) \mid 1 \leq j \leq m_1\}$ is a dominating set in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. For let $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t) \in V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))$ be an arbitrary vertex. Since D_1 is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$, there exist $v_{1j} \in D_1$ such that $v_{1j}u_1 = u_1v_{1j}$ or $v_{1j} = u_1$. Thus $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t) \in N((v_{1j}, 0, \ldots, 0))$ in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. Let $D' = \{(v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \ldots, v_{tj}) \mid v_{ij} \in V(\Gamma(R_i)), j = 1, \ldots, m_1 - 1\} \subseteq V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. Let $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t)$ be an arbitrary vertex in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. Since D' is a dominating set in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$, there exist a $v_{1j} \in V(\Gamma(R_1))$ such that $u_1v_{1j} = v_{1j}u_1$ or $u_1 = v_{1j}$. Whenever $\{v_{11}, v_{12}, \ldots, v_{1(m_1-1)}\}$ is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$. This contradicts the fact that D_1 is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$. Hence D is a dominating set in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$, as claimed. Therefore $\gamma(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) = Min_{1 \leq i \leq t}(\gamma(\Gamma(R_i)))$. □

Theorem 3.1.13 *Let R_1 be a non-commutative ring of order n_1 and $Z(R_1) = 0$. Also, let R_2 be a commutative ring of order n_2. Then*

$$\gamma(\Gamma(R_1 \times R_2)) = \gamma(\Gamma(R_1)).$$

Proof. Let $G = \Gamma(R_1 \times R_2)$ and $G' = \Gamma(R_1) \boxtimes K_{n_2}$ such that the members of $V(K_{n_2})$ are the elements of R_2. It is easy to see that $G \cong G'$. It is sufficient to prove that $\gamma(G') = \gamma(\Gamma(R_1))$. Let $\gamma(\Gamma(R_1)) = m$ and $D = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m\}$ be a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$. It will be claimed, $D' = \{(v_i, u_0) \mid v_i \in D\}$ is a dominating set in G', where $u_0 \in V(K_{n_2})$. Let $(v, u') \in V(G')$ be an arbitrary vertex. Since D is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$, there exist $v_i \in D$ such that $v_iv = vv_i$ or $v = v_i$. By strongly product structure, $(v, u') \in N((v_i, u_0))$. Let $D'' = \{(x_i, u_i) | i = 1, \ldots, m-1\} \subseteq V(G')$ be a dominating set in G'. Let (v, u) be an arbitrary vertex in G'. Since D'' is a dominating set in G', there exist a $v_i \in V(\Gamma(R_1))$ such that (v, u) is adjacent to (v_i, u_i). By strongly product structure, $v = v_i$ or $vv_i = v_iv$. whenever $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{m-1}\}$ is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$. This contradicts the fact that D is a dominating set in $\Gamma(R_1)$. Thus D' is a dominating set in G', as claimed. Hence $\gamma(G') = \gamma(\Gamma(R_1))$. □

3.2. Signed domination number in $\Gamma(R)$

Proof of Theorem D. Let $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = n - 1$. By Lemma 2.3.1, every $v \in V(\Gamma(R))$ is either isolated, an endvertex or adjacent to an endvertex. Let $v \in V(\Gamma(R))$ such that $deg(v) = 1$ and $v \in N(u)$. Then $C(v) = \{0, v, u\}$. Thus $u = -v$ and $deg(u) = 1$. Hence by Lemma 2.1.3, $\Gamma(R)$ is an empty graph or union of edges.
If n is even, then $\Gamma(R)$ containing isolated vertices. Thus $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a complete graph. By Theorem 2.1.10, $R \cong E$ or $R \cong F$ and (i) is proved.
If n is odd, then $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of $\frac{n-1}{2}$ copies of P_2 and (ii) is proved. The proof of converse is simple. □

Theorem 3.2.1 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n, where n is an odd number and $|Z(R)| = c \neq 0$. Then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = n - 1$ if and only if $\Gamma(R)$ is the union of $\frac{n-c}{2}$ copies of P_2.*

proof. Let $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = n - 1$. By Lemma 2.3.1, every $v \in V(\Gamma(R))$ is either isolated, an endvertex or adjacent to an endvertex. If x is an isolated vertex in $\Gamma(R)$, then $C(x) = Z(R) \cup \{x\}$. Thus $O(x) = 2$, a contradiction. Let $v \in V(\Gamma(R))$ such that $deg(v) = 1$ and $v \in N(u)$. Then $C(v) = Z(R) \cup \{v, u\}$. Since n is an odd

number, $u = -v$ and so $deg(u) = 1$. Therefore $\Gamma(R)$ is the union of $\frac{n-c}{2}$ copies of P_2. The proof of converse is simple. □

Theorem 3.2.2 *Let the situation be as in Theorem B. Then*
i) $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = 2(p^2 + p + 1)$.
or
ii) $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = 2(\ell_1 + \ell_2)$, *where* ℓ_1 *and* ℓ_2 *satisfy in* $\ell_1 + (p+1)\ell_2 = p^2 + p + 1$.

proof.
i) As in the proof of Theorem B, $\Gamma(R)$ is the disjoint union of $p^2 + p + 1$ copies of the complete graphs of size $p - 1$. By Theorem 2.3.3, $\gamma_s(K_{p-1}) = 2$. Hence $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = 2(p^2 + p + 1)$, and (i) is proved.
ii) As in the proof of Theorem B, $\Gamma(R)$ is the disjoint union of ℓ_1 copies of the complete graphs of size $p - 1$ and ℓ_2 copies of the complete graph of size $p^2 - 1$, where $\ell_1 + (p+1)\ell_2 = p^2 + p + 1$. By Theorem 2.3.3, $\gamma_s(\Gamma(R)) = 2(\ell_1 + \ell_2)$, and (ii) is proved. □

Lemma 3.2.3 *Let R be a non-commutative finite ring and* $Z(R) = \{0\}$. *If* $0 \neq |V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| = t$, *then the followings are hold.*

i) $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq 2t + 1$

ii) $|R| \leq 4t + 2$.

proof.
i) On the contrary, let $v \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ and $deg(v) = \delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \geq 2t + 2$. If $N(v) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R))}\}$, then consider the function $f : V(G) \to \{-1, 1\}$ for which $f(w) = -1$ if and only if $w \in \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{\lfloor \frac{\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)}{2} \rfloor}\}$. Clearly, $f[w] \geq 1$, for all $w \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$. So f is a signed dominating function. This implies that $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| \geq t + 1$, contrary to assumption.
ii) On the contrary, let $|R| \geq 4t + 3$. By Lemma 2.1.1, $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \geq 2t + 2$, which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 3.2.4 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and* $Z(R) = \{0\}$. *Then* $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \notin \{n - 1, n - 5\}$.

proof. On the contrary, let $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \in \{n - 1, n - 5\}$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. Let $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 1$. If $n = 4$, then $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = K_3$ and so $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \neq n - 1$. By corollary 2.1.7, $n \geq 8$. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a connected graph, by Lemma 2.3.1, every $v \in \overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is an endvertex or adjacent to an endvertex. We claim that $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ have exactly one vertex with degree greater than 1.
Suppose that $deg(u), deg(v) > 1$. So there are $x, y \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $x \in N(u)$ and $y \in N(v)$. Since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is a connected graph and by theorem 2.1.4, $diam(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$, $v = u$ and $x - v - u$. Hence $\overline{\Gamma}(R) \cong K_{1,n}$, contrary to Theorem 2.1.5. Therefore $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \neq n - 1$.
Case 2. Let $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 5$. Then $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| = 2$. By Lemma 3.2.3, $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \leq 5$ and $n \leq 10$. By Corrolary 2.1.7, $n \geq 8$. By Lemmas 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, $n \notin \{8, 10\}$. Let $n = 9$ and $v \in V(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$ such that $deg(v) = k = \delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R))$. By Lemma 2.1.1, $k \geq 5$ and so $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 5$. Hence $|C(v)| \nmid 9$, a contradiction. Therefore $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) \neq n - 5$. □

Theorem 3.2.5 *Let R be a non-commutative ring of order n and* $Z(R) = \{0\}$. *Then* $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 3$ *if and only if R is isomorphic with one of the following rings*
$E = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = x, yx = y \rangle$
$F = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = y, yx = x \rangle$.

Proof. Let $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 3$. Then $|V^-(\overline{\Gamma}(R))| = 1$. By Corrolary 2.1.7 and Lemma 3.2.3, $n = 4$ and $\delta(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$. Thus $\overline{\Gamma}(R) = K_3$. Hence by Theorem 2.1.10, R is one of the following rings
$E = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = x, yx = y \rangle$
$F = \langle x, y \mid 2x = 2y = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = y, yx = x \rangle$.
The proof of converse is straightforward. □

Corollary 3.2.6 *Let the situation be as in 3.2.5. If* $\gamma_s(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = n - 3$, *then* $\gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 1$.

Proof of Theorem E.
Let $v_i \in V(\Gamma(R_i))$ and $deg(v_i) = \delta_i$, where $1 \leq i \leq t$. Since $Z(R_i) = \{0\}$, $Z(\prod_{i=1}^t R_i) = 0$. If $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_t) \in V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^t R_i))$, then $N[(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_t)] = \{(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t) \mid$

$x_i \in N[v_i] \bigcup \{0\}\} \setminus \{(0,0,\ldots,0)\}$. Thus $deg((v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_t)) = (\prod_{i=1}^{t}(\delta_i+2)) - 2$. Also $(v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_t)$ is a vertex of minimum degree in $\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)$. Let $\delta = (\prod_{i=1}^{t}(\delta_i+2)) - 2$ and use $u_i \in V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))$, $1 \leq i \leq \delta$, to denote the neighbors of $(v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_t)$. Consider the function $f : V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \to \{-1,1\}$ for which $f(u_j) = -1$ and $f(u_k) = 1$, such that $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor + 1 \leq k \leq \delta$. Also, for each $u \in V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))$ such that $u \neq u_i$, $f(u) = 1$. Clearly, $f[w] \geq 1$, for all $w \in V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))$. Therefore f is a signed dominating function. Hence $|V^-(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))| \geq \lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$. Since $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) = |V(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))| - 2|V^-(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i))|$, it follows that $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i) - 1 - 2\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. Let δ be odd. Then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i) - 1 - 2\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$. It follows that $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i) - 1 - 2\lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2} \rfloor$. Hence $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i) - \delta$ and (i) is proved.

Case 2. Let there exist $1 \leq i \leq t$ such that δ_i be even. Then $\gamma_s(\Gamma(\prod_{i=1}^{t} R_i)) \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i) - 1 - \delta$ and (ii) is proved. □

References

[1] S. Akbari, H. Bidkhori and A. Mohammadian, (2008), Commuting graph of Matrix Algebra, Communication in Algebra, 36: 4020-4031.

[2] S. Akbari, M. Ghandehari, H. Radjavi, M. Hadadian and A. Mohammadian, (2004), On the commuting graphs of semisimple rings, Linear Algebra Appl, 345-355.

[3] S. Akbari, A. Mohammadian, H. Radjavi, P. Raja, (2006), On the diameters of commuting graphs, Linear Algebra and its Application, 161-176.

[4] S. Akbari, P. Raja, (2006), Commuting graphs of some subsets in simple rings, Linear Algebra APPL., 416:1038-1047.

[5] T. J. Bean, M. A. Henning, and H. C. Swart, (1994), On the integrity of distance domination in graphs, Australas. J. Combin., 10: 29-43.

[6] W. Chen, E. Song, (2006), Lower bounds on several version of signed domination number, Discrete Mathematics, 1837-1846.

[7] J. F. Fink, M. S. Jacobson, L. F. Kinch and J. Roberts, (1985), On graphs having domination number half their order, Period. Math. Hunger., 16: 287-293.

[8] P. Flach, L. Volkmann, (1990), Estimations for the domination number of a graph, Discrete Math, 145-151.

[9] S. Gravier, A. Khelladi, (1995), On the domination number of cross products of graphs, Discrete Mathematics, 145: 273-277.

[10] Ruth Haas, Thomas B. Wexler, (2002), Bounds on the signed domination number of a graph, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics, 742-750.

[11] Ruth Haas, Thomas B. Wexler, (2004), Signed domination number of a graph and its complement, Discrete Mathematics, 87-92.

[12] W. Haynes, T. Hedetniemi, J. Slater, (1998), Fundementals of domination in graphs, MARCEL DEKKER INC..

[13] F. Jaeger, C. Payan, (1972), Relation du type Nordhaus-Gaddum pour le numbered absorption dun graphe simple, C. R. Acard. Sci. Paris, 274: 728-730.

[14] G. R. Omidi, E. Vatandoost, (2011), On the commuting graph of rings, Journal of Algebra and It's Applications, 10: 521-527.

[15] O. Ore, (1962), Theory of Graphs, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. PubL, 38 (Amer. Math. Soc, Providence, RI).

[16] C. Payan, (1975), Sur le nombre d'absorption d'un graphe simple, Cahiers Centre Etudes Rech. Oper. B.3.4, 171.

[17] G. Scorza, (1926), I gruppi che possono pensarsi come somma di tre loro sottogruppi, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital., 5: 216-218.

[18] H. B. Walikar, B. D. Acharya, and E. Sampathkumar, (1979), Recent develop- developments in the theory of domination in graphs, In MRI Lecture Notes in Math., Mahta Research Instil, Allahabad, volume 1.